

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
FILED IN THE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Nov 18, 2020

SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

CALEB H.¹

No. 4:20-CV-5006-EFS

Plaintiff,

v.

ANDREW M. SAUL, the Commissioner
of Social Security,

Defendant.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
SUMMARY-JUDGMENT MOTION
AND GRANTING DEFENDANT'S
SUMMARY-JUDGMENT MOTION**

Before the Court are the parties' cross summary-judgment motions.²

Plaintiff Caleb H. appeals the denial of benefits by the Administrative Law
Judge (ALJ). He alleges the ALJ erred by 1) failing to consider the U.S.
Department of Veteran Affairs' finding that Plaintiff was disabled, 2)
discounting Plaintiff's symptom reports, 3) failing to properly consider lay

¹ To protect the privacy of the social-security Plaintiff, the Court refers to him
by first name and last initial or by "Plaintiff." *See* LCivR 5.2(c).

² ECF Nos. 13 & 15.

1 statements, 4) improperly determining that the impairments did not meet or
2 equal Listing 1.02A, 1.04, 1.06, and 11.14, and 5) improperly determining
3 step five based on an incomplete hypothetical question. In contrast,
4 Defendant Commissioner of Social Security asks the Court to affirm the
5 ALJ's decision finding Plaintiff not disabled. After reviewing the record and
6 relevant authority, the Court denies Plaintiff's Motion for Summary
7 Judgment, ECF No. 13, and grants the Commissioner's Motion for Summary
8 Judgment, ECF No. 15.

9 **I. Five-Step Disability Determination**

10 A five-step sequential evaluation process is used to determine whether
11 an adult claimant is disabled.³ Step one assesses whether the claimant is
12 currently engaged in substantial gainful activity.⁴ If the claimant is engaged
13 in substantial gainful activity, benefits are denied.⁵ If not, the disability-
14 evaluation proceeds to step two.⁶

15 Step two assesses whether the claimant has a medically severe
16 impairment, or combination of impairments, which significantly limits the
17

18
19 ³ 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520(a).

20 ⁴ *Id.* § 404.1520(a)(4)(i).

21 ⁵ *Id.* § 404.1520(b).

22 ⁶ *Id.* § 404.1520(b).

1 claimant's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities.⁷ If the
2 claimant does not, benefits are denied.⁸ If the claimant does, the disability-
3 evaluation proceeds to step three.⁹

4 Step three compares the claimant's impairment(s) to several
5 recognized by the Commissioner to be so severe as to preclude substantial
6 gainful activity.¹⁰ If an impairment meets or equals one of the listed
7 impairments, the claimant is conclusively presumed to be disabled.¹¹ If an
8 impairment does not, the disability-evaluation proceeds to step four.

9 Step four assesses whether an impairment prevents the claimant from
10 performing work he performed in the past by determining the claimant's
11 residual functional capacity (RFC).¹² If the claimant is able to perform prior
12 work, benefits are denied.¹³ If the claimant cannot perform prior work, the
13 disability-evaluation proceeds to step five.

14

15

16⁷ 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520(a)(4)(ii).

17⁸ *Id.* § 404.1520(c).

18⁹ *Id.*

19¹⁰ *Id.* § 404.1520(a)(4)(iii).

20¹¹ *Id.* § 404.1520(d).

21¹² *Id.* § 404.1520(a)(4)(iv).

22¹³ *Id.*

1 Step five, the final step, assesses whether the claimant can perform
2 other substantial gainful work—work that exists in significant numbers in
3 the national economy—considering the claimant’s RFC, age, education, and
4 work experience.¹⁴ If so, benefits are denied. If not, benefits are granted.¹⁵

5 The claimant has the initial burden of establishing entitlement to
6 disability benefits under steps one through four.¹⁶ At step five, the burden
7 shifts to the Commissioner to show that the claimant is not entitled to
8 benefits.¹⁷

9 II. Factual and Procedural Summary

10 Plaintiff filed a Title II application, alleging an amended disability
11 onset date of February 28, 2018.¹⁸ His claim was denied initially and upon
12 reconsideration.¹⁹ A video administrative hearing was held before
13 Administrative Law Judge Stewart Stallings.²⁰

15 ¹⁴ 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520(a)(4)(v); *Kail v. Heckler*, 722 F.2d 1496, 1497-98 (9th
16 Cir. 1984).

17 ¹⁵ 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520(g).

18 ¹⁶ *Parra v. Astrue*, 481 F.3d 742, 746 (9th Cir. 2007).

19 ¹⁷ *Id.*

20 ¹⁸ AR 59.

21 ¹⁹ AR 62-74 & 76-91.

22 ²⁰ AR 37-60.

1 In denying Plaintiff's disability claim, the ALJ made the following
2 findings:

3 • Plaintiff met the insured status requirements through December
4 31, 2023;

5 • Step one: Plaintiff had not engaged in substantial gainful
6 activity since February 28, 2018, the alleged onset date;

7 • Step two: Plaintiff had the following medically determinable
8 severe impairments: bilateral hip degenerative joint disease,
9 right foot injury/fracture status-post surgery (2013), obesity,
10 post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and anxiety;

11 • Step three: Plaintiff did not have an impairment or combination
12 of impairments that met or medically equaled the severity of one
13 of the listed impairments;

14 • RFC: Plaintiff had the RFC to perform sedentary work with the
15 following limitations:

16 He requires a sit/stand option every 30 minutes. He is limited to
17 no operation of foot controls with the right lower extremity. He
18 can never climb ladders/ropes/scaffolds and only occasionally
19 climb ramps/stairs, and occasionally balance, stooping, kneeling,
20 crouching and crawling. He must avoid work around hazards
21 such as unprotected heights and dangerous moving machinery.
22 He is limited to no more than frequent contact with the public
23 and only occasional interaction with co-workers and supervisors.

21 • Step four: Plaintiff was not capable of performing past relevant
22 work; and

1 • Step five: considering Plaintiff's RFC, age, education, and work
2 history, Plaintiff could perform work that existed in significant
3 numbers in the national economy, such as telemarketer,
4 agricultural produce sorter, and final assembler.²¹

5 When assessing the medical-opinion evidence, the ALJ could not "defer
6 or give any specific evidentiary weight, including controlling weight, to any
7 prior . . . medical opinion(s)."²²

8 The ALJ also found that Plaintiff's medically determinable
9 impairments could reasonably be expected to cause some of the alleged
10 symptoms, but that his statements concerning the intensity, persistence, and
11 limiting effects of those symptoms were not entirely consistent with the
12 medical evidence and other evidence in the record.²³ Likewise, the ALJ
13 discounted the lay statements from Plaintiff's wife.²⁴

14 Plaintiff requested review of the ALJ's decision by the Appeals Council,
15 which denied review.²⁵ Plaintiff timely appealed to this Court.

16
17
18 ²¹ AR 17-31.

19 ²² AR 27.

20 ²³ AR 23-28.

21 ²⁴ AR 29.

22 ²⁵ AR 1-3.

III. Standard of Review

A district court's review of the Commissioner's final decision is limited.²⁶ The Commissioner's decision is set aside "only if it is not supported by substantial evidence or is based on legal error."²⁷ Substantial evidence is "more than a mere scintilla but less than a preponderance; it is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion."²⁸ Moreover, because it is the role of the ALJ and not the Court to weigh conflicting evidence, the Court upholds the ALJ's findings "if they are supported by inferences reasonably drawn from the record."²⁹ The Court considers the entire record as a whole.³⁰

²⁶ 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

²⁷ *Hill v. Astrue*, 698 F.3d 1153, 1158 (9th Cir. 2012).

²⁸ *Id.* at 1159 (quoting *Sandgathe v. Chater*, 108 F.3d 978, 980 (9th Cir. 1997)).

²⁹ *Molina v. Astrue*, 674 F.3d 1104, 1111 (9th Cir. 2012).

³⁰ *Lingenfelter v. Astrue*, 504 F.3d 1028, 1035 (9th Cir. 2007) (The court “must consider the entire record as whole, weighing both the evidence that supports and the evidence that detracts from the Commissioner's conclusion,” not simply the evidence cited by the ALJ or the parties.); *Black v. Apfel*, 143 F.3d 383, 386 (8th Cir. 1998) (“An ALJ's failure to cite specific evidence does not indicate that such evidence was not considered[.]”).

Further, the Court may not reverse an ALJ decision due to a harmless error.³¹ An error is harmless “where it is inconsequential to the [ALJ’s] ultimate nondisability determination.”³² The party appealing the ALJ’s decision generally bears the burden of establishing harm.³³

IV. Analysis

A. VA's disability determination

Plaintiff argues the ALJ improperly rejected the VA's disability determination that he was 80% disabled.³⁴ He states that the VA's finding was supported by "several hundred pages of medical records."³⁵ Defendant argues that the ALJ properly considered the medical evidence from the VA under the new regulations.³⁶

The ALJ correctly described the requirements of the new regulations, which apply to applications filed on or after March 27, 2017. As the ALJ noted, the regulations do not require ALJs to “provide any analysis in [their] determination or decision about a decision made by another governmental

³¹ *Molina*, 674 F.3d at 1111.

³² *Id.* at 1115 (quotation and citation omitted).

³³ *Shinseki v. Sanders*, 556 U.S. 396, 409-10 (2009).

³⁴ ECF No. 13 at 10-12.

³⁵ *Id.* at 11.

³⁶ ECF No. 15 at 16.

1 agency or a nongovernment entity about whether [claimants] are disabled,
2 blind, employable, or entitled to any benefits.”³⁷ Further, an ALJ is not
3 required to assign “any specific evidentiary weight, including controlling
4 weight, to . . . prior administrative medical finding(s).”³⁸ Instead, the ALJ will
5 consider “all of the supporting evidence underlying the other governmental
6 agency or nongovernmental entity’s decision that [the ALJ] received as
7 evidence” for the disability claim.”³⁹

8 Although Plaintiff acknowledges that the new regulations apply to his
9 claim, Plaintiff argues that “there is no indication that [the ALJ] considered
10 all of the supporting evidence underlying the VA’s decision.”⁴⁰ Plaintiff relies
11 on *McCartey v. Massanari*, in which the Ninth Circuit ordered remand for
12 payment of benefits where the VA’s 80% disability determination was
13 supported by several hundred pages of medical records.⁴¹ As in *McCartey*,
14 Plaintiff contends that when the evidence underlying the VA’s decision in his
15 case is properly considered, particularly the evidence related to Plaintiff’s
16
17

18 ³⁷ 20 C.F.R. § 404.1504.

19 ³⁸ 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520c(a).

20 ³⁹ 20 C.F.R. § 404.1504.

21 ⁴⁰ ECF No. 13 at 11.

22 ⁴¹ 298 F.3d 1072, 1076 (9th Cir. 2002).

1 PTSD symptoms, the ALJ would find that he is unable to maintain regular,
 2 continuous employment.⁴²

3 *McCartey* was decided before the new regulations took effect, but
 4 Plaintiff argues that *McCartey* is still “established law in the Ninth Circuit;”
 5 therefore, the “ALJ must give great weight to a VA determination of
 6 disability.”⁴³ *McCartey* was rendered before the new regulation; thus, as
 7 other district courts have decided, it is unpersuasive here.⁴⁴ As to the medical
 8 records underlying the VA’s opinion here, the record contains many
 9 treatment records from Memorial VA Center, and other providers, that span
 10 from 2015 to 2018.⁴⁵ The ALJ considered these records and discussed them in
 11 his decision.⁴⁶ On this record, the ALJ properly considered the underlying
 12 evidence supporting Plaintiff’s VA disability rating.

13

14⁴² ECF No. 13 at 11-12.

15⁴³ *Id.* at 11.

16⁴⁴ See, e.g., *Edward L.C. v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. C19-5208-MLP, 2019 WL
 17 6789813, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 12, 2019) (“The Court declines to adopt
 18 Plaintiff’s interpretation and instead finds the ALJ is no longer required to
 19 assign weight to VA disability determinations.”); see also *Kathleen H. v. Saul*,
 20 No. 3:19-cv-00189-AA, 2020 WL 5017760, at *5 (D. Or. Aug. 25, 2020).

21⁴⁵ AR 306-834.

22⁴⁶ AR 22, 25-28, & 29.

1 **B. Step Three (Listings): Plaintiff fails to establish error.**

2 Plaintiff contends the ALJ erred by finding that Plaintiff's
3 impairments did not meet Listing 12.15⁴⁷ for PTSD and by not considering
4 Listing 11.14.⁴⁸ Plaintiff also asserts he meets or medically equals Listings
5 1.02A, 1.04, and 1.06, and 11.14, singly or in combination, due to marked
6 difficulties in physical functioning and the inability to ambulate effectively.⁴⁹

7 At step three, the ALJ must determine if a claimant's impairments
8 meet or equal a listed impairment.⁵⁰ "To meet a listed impairment, a
9 claimant must establish that he or she meets each characteristic of a listed
10 impairment relevant to his or her claim."⁵¹ "To equal a listed impairment, a
11 claimant must establish symptoms, signs and laboratory findings 'at least
12 equal in severity and duration' to the characteristics of a relevant listed
13 impairment."⁵² "If a claimant suffers from multiple impairments and none of

15 ⁴⁷ The Court notes Plaintiff does not explain how the ALJ erred by finding
16 Plaintiff's impairments did not meet Listing 12.15.

17 ⁴⁸ ECF No. 13 at 12.

18 ⁴⁹ *Id.* at 12-13.

19 ⁵⁰ 20 C.F.R. § 416.920(a)(4)(iii).

20 ⁵¹ *Tackett*, 180 F.3d at 1099 (emphasis in original); 20 C.F.R. § 416.925(d).

21 ⁵² *Tackett*, 180 F.3d at 1099 (emphasis in original) (quoting 20 C.F.R. §
22 404.1526(a)); 20 C.F.R. § 416.926(a).

1 them individually meets or equals a listed impairment, the collective
2 symptoms, signs and laboratory findings of all of the claimant's impairments
3 will be evaluated to determine whether they meet or equal the characteristics
4 of any relevant listed impairment.”⁵³ However, “[m]edical equivalence must
5 be based on medical findings,” and “[a] generalized assertion of functional
6 problems is not enough to establish disability at step three.”⁵⁴ The claimant
7 bears the burden of establishing his impairment (or combination of
8 impairments) meets or equals the criteria of a listed impairments.⁵⁵

9 Plaintiff contends the ALJ erred in not finding he meets or equals a
10 listing because Plaintiff has marked limitations in physical functioning and
11 the inability to ambulate. Section 11.00 defines marked limitations and
12 physical functioning as:

13 For this criterion, a marked limitation means that, due to the signs
14 and symptoms of your neurological disorder, you are seriously limited
15 in the ability to independently initiate, sustain, and complete work-
16 related physical activities (see 11.00G3). You may have a marked
17 limitation in your physical functioning when your neurological disease
18 process causes persistent or intermittent symptoms that affect your
19 abilities to independently initiate, sustain, and complete work-related
activities, such as standing, balancing, walking, using both upper
extremities for fine and gross movements, or results in limitations in
using one upper and one lower extremity. The persistent and
intermittent symptoms must result in a serious limitation in your
ability to do a task or activity on a sustained basis. We do not define

20 ⁵³ *Tackett*, 180 F.3d at 1099.

21 ⁵⁴ *Id.* at 1100 (quoting 20 C.F.R. § 404.1526(a)); 20 C.F.R. § 416.926(a).

22 ⁵⁵ *Burch*, 400 F.3d at 683.

1 "marked" by a specific number of different physical activities or tasks
2 that demonstrate your ability, but by the overall effects of your
3 neurological symptoms on your ability to perform such physical
4 activities on a consistent and sustained basis. You need not be totally
5 precluded from performing a function or activity to have a marked
6 limitation, as long as the degree of limitation seriously limits your
7 ability to independently initiate, sustain, and complete work-related
8 physical activities.⁵⁶

9 Listing 1.00B2b defines the ability to ambulate effectively as:

10 (1) Definition. Inability to ambulate effectively means an extreme
11 limitation of the ability to walk; i.e., an impairment(s) that
12 interferes very seriously with the individual's ability to
13 independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities. Ineffective
14 ambulation is defined generally as having insufficient lower
15 extremity functioning (see 1.00J) to permit independent
16 ambulation without the use of a hand-held assistive device(s)
17 that limits the functioning of both upper extremities.

18 ...

19 (2) To ambulate effectively, individuals must be capable of
20 sustaining a reasonable walking pace over a sufficient distance to
21 be able to carry out activities of daily living. They must have the
22 ability to travel without companion assistance to and from a
23 place of employment or school. Therefore, examples of ineffective
ambulation include, but are not limited to, the inability to walk
without the use of a walker, two crutches or two canes, the
inability to walk a block at a reasonable pace on rough or uneven
surfaces, the inability to use standard public transportation, the
inability to carry out routine ambulatory activities, such as
shopping and banking, and the inability to climb a few steps at a
reasonable pace with the use of a single hand rail. The ability to
walk independently about one's home without the use of assistive
devices does not, in and of itself, constitute effective
ambulation.⁵⁷

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
7710
7711
7712
7713
7714
7715
7716
7717
7718
7719
7720
7721
7722
7723
7724
7725
7726
7727
7728
7729
7730
7731
7732
7733
7734
7735
7736
7737
7738
7739
7740
7741
7742
7743
7744
7745
7746
7747
7748
7749
7750
7751
7752
7753
7754
7755
7756
7757
7758
7759
7760
7761
7762
7763
7764
7765
7766
7767
7768
7769
7770
7771
7772
7773
7774
7775
7776
7777
7778
7779
77710
77711
77712
77713
77714
77715
77716
77717
77718
77719
77720
77721
77722
77723
77724
77725
77726
77727
77728
77729
77730
77731
77732
77733
77734
77735
77736
77737
77738
77739
77740
77741
77742
77743
77744
77745
77746
77747
77748
77749
77750
77751
77752
77753
77754
77755
77756
77757
77758
77759
77760
77761
77762
77763
77764
77765
77766
77767
77768
77769
77770
77771
77772
77773
77774
77775
77776
77777
77778
77779
777710
777711
777712
777713
777714
777715
777716
777717
777718
777719
777720
777721
777722
777723
777724
777725
777726
777727
777728
777729
777730
777731
777732
777733
777734
777735
777736
777737
777738
777739
777740
777741
777742
777743
777744
777745
777746
777747
777748
777749
777750
777751
777752
777753
777754
777755
777756
777757
777758
777759
777760
777761
777762
777763
777764
777765
777766
777767
777768
777769
777770
777771
777772
777773
777774
777775
777776
777777
777778
777779
7777710
7777711
7777712
7777713
7777714
7777715
7777716
7777717
7777718
7777719
7777720
7777721
7777722
7777723
7777724
7777725
7777726
7777727
7777728
7777729
7777730
7777731
7777732
7777733
7777734
7777735
7777736
7777737
7777738
7777739
7777740
7777741
7777742
7777743
7777744
7777745
7777746
7777747
7777748
7777749
7777750
7777751
7777752
7777753
7777754
7777755
7777756
7777757
7777758
7777759
7777760
7777761
7777762
7777763
7777764
7777765
7777766
7777767
7777768
7777769
7777770
7777771
7777772
7777773
7777774
7777775
7777776
7777777
7777778
7777779
77777710
77777711
77777712
77777713
77777714
77777715
77777716
77777717
77777718
77777719
77777720
77777721
77777722
77777723
77777724
77777725
77777726
77777727
77777728
77777729
77777730
77777731
77777732
77777733
77777734
77777735
77777736
77777737
77777738
77777739
77777740
77777741
77777742
77777743
77777744
77777745
77777746
77777747
77777748
77777749
77777750
77777751
77777752
77777753
77777754
77777755
77777756
77777757
77777758
77777759
77777760
77777761
77777762
77777763
77777764
77777765
77777766
77777767
77777768
77777769
77777770
77777771
77777772
77777773
77777774
77777775
77777776
77777777
77777778
77777779
777777710
777777711
777777712
777777713
777777714
777777715
777777716
777777717
777777718
777777719
777777720
777777721
777777722
777777723
777777724
777777725
777777726
777777727
777777728
777777729
777777730
777777731
777777732
777777733
777777734
777777735
777777736
777777737
777777738
777777739
777777740
777777741
777777742
777777743
777777744
777777745
777777746
777777747
777777748
777777749
777777750
777777751
777777752
777777753
777777754
777777755
777777756
777777757
777777758
777777759
777777760
777777761
777777762
777777763
777777764
777777765
777777766
777777767
777777768
777777769
777777770
777777771
777777772
777777773
777777774
777777775
777777776
777777777
777777778
777777779
7777777710
7777777711
7777777712
7777777713
7777777714
7777777715
7777777716
7777777717
7777777718
7777777719
7777777720
7777777721
7777777722
7777777723
7777777724
7777777725
7777777726
7777777727
7777777728
7777777729
7777777730
7777777731
7777777732
7777777733
7777777734
7777777735
7777777736
7777777737
7777777738
7777777739
7777777740
7777777741
7777777742
7777777743
7777777744
7777777745
7777777746
7777777747
7777777748
7777777749
7777777750
7777777751
7777777752
7777777753
7777777754
7777777755
7777777756
7777777757
7777777758
7777777759
7777777760
7777777761
7777777762
7777777763
7777777764
7777777765
7777777766
7777777767
7777777768
7777777769
7777777770
7777777771
7777777772
7777777773
7777777774
7777777775
7777777776
7777777777
7777777778
7777777779
77777777710
77777777711
77777777712
77777777713
77777777714
77777777715
77777777716
77777777717
77777777718
77777777719
77777777720
77777777721
77777777722
77777777723
77777777724
77777777725
77777777726
77777777727
77777777728
77777777729
77777777730
77777777731
77777777732
77777777733
77777777734
77777777735
77777777736
77777777737
77777777738
77777777739
77777777740
77777777741
77777777742
77777777743
77777777744
77777777745
77777777746
77777777747
77777777748
77777777749
77777777750
77777777751
77777777752
77777777753
77777777754
77777777755
77777777756
77777777757
77777777758
77777777759
77777777760
77777777761
77777777762
77777777763
77777777764
77777777765
77777777766
77777777767
77777777768
77777777769
77777777770
77777777771
77777777772
77777777773
77777777774
77777777775
77777777776
77777777777
77777777778
77777777779
777777777710
777777777711
777777777712
777777777713
777777777714
777777777715
777777777716
777777777717
777777777718
777777777719
777777777720
777777777721
777777777722
777777777723
777777777724
777777777725
777777777726
777777777727
777777777728
777777777729
777777777730
777777777731
777777777732
777777777733
777777777734
777777777735
777777777736
777777777737
777777777738
777777777739
777777777740
777777777741
777777777742
777777777743
777777777744
777777777745
777777777746
777777777747
777777777748
777777777749
777777777750
777777777751
777777777752
777777777753
777777777754
777777777755
777777777756
777777777757
777777777758
777777777759
777777777760
777777777761
777777777762
777777777763
777777777764
777777777765
777777777766
777777777767
777777777768
777777777769
777777777770
777777777771
777777777772
777777777773
777777777774
777777777775
777777777776
777777777777
777777777778
777777777779
7777777777710
7777777777711
7777777777712
7777777777713
7777777777714
7777777777715
7777777777716
7777777777717
7777777777718
7777777777719
7777777777720
7777777777721
7777777777722
7777777777723
7777777777724
7777777777725
7777777777726
7777777777727
7777777777728
7777777777729
7777777777730
7777777777731
7777777777732
7777777777733
7777777777734
7777777777735
7777777777736
7777777777737
7777777777738
7777777777739
7777777777740
7777777777741
7777777777742
7777777777743
7777777777744
7777777777745
7777777777746
7777777777747
7777777777748
7777777777749
7777777777750
7777777777751
77

1 The Court finds the ALJ's articulated reasoning and analysis sufficiently
2 specific (in light of the entire ALJ decision) and supported by substantial evidence.
3 The ALJ reviewed the record and found that Plaintiff was able to ambulate without
4 an assistive device, attend to his personal care/hygiene, fix his own meals, complete
5 household chores, shop in stores, and drive a vehicle.⁵⁸ The ALJ also highlighted
6 Plaintiff's neuromuscular examinations and found no significant limiting
7 neurologic deficits (e.g., typically normal/full motor strength, intact sensation and
8 symmetric reflexes; no atrophy; ambulates without assistive device).⁵⁹ The
9 evidence Plaintiff identifies does not undermine the ALJ's finding. When
10 considering the record as a whole, the Plaintiff has not met his burden of
11 demonstrating that his impairments met or equaled the criteria of Listings 1.02A.
12 1.04, 1.06, and 11.14.

13 _____
14 ⁵⁸ AR 20.

15 ⁵⁹ AR 20 (citing AR 414 ("Cranial nerves II-XII grossly intact. Strength equal
16 and adequate bilaterally. Sensation to light touch intact. Gait normal."); AR
17 612-13 (presented with antalgic gait, no assistive device, moderate degree of
18 tenderness on palpation of the bilateral forefoot, as well as both hips,
19 diminished ROM of both hips, able to squat and tandem walk, unable to hop,
20 no foot drop, straight leg raise test negative bilaterally in seated and supine
21 position, motor function 5/5 in upper and lower extremities); AR 825-26; AR
22 833 (moderate finding after EMG and nerve conduction studies).
23

1 **C. Plaintiff's Symptom Reports: Plaintiff fails to establish error.**

2 Plaintiff argues the ALJ failed to provide valid reasons for rejecting his
3 symptom reports. When examining a claimant's symptom reports, the ALJ must
4 make a two-step inquiry. "First, the ALJ must determine whether there is objective
5 medical evidence of an underlying impairment which could reasonably be expected
6 to produce the pain or other symptoms alleged."⁶⁰ Second, "[i]f the claimant meets
7 the first test and there is no evidence of malingering, the ALJ can only reject the
8 claimant's testimony about the severity of the symptoms if [the ALJ] gives 'specific,
9 clear and convincing reasons' for the rejection."⁶¹ Here, the ALJ found Plaintiff's
10 statements concerning the intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of his
11 symptoms inconsistent with the objective medical evidence, treatment, and daily
12 activities.⁶²

13 First, as to the ALJ's finding that Plaintiff's symptom reports were
14 inconsistent with the objective medical evidence, symptom reports cannot be solely
15 discounted on the grounds that they were not fully corroborated by the objective
16 medical evidence.⁶³ However, objective medical evidence is a relevant factor in
17

18 ⁶⁰ *Molina*, 674 F.3d at 1112.

19 ⁶¹ *Ghanim v. Colvin*, 763 F.3d 1154, 1163 (9th Cir. 2014) (quoting
20 *Lingenfelter*, 504 F.3d at 1036).

21 ⁶² AR 23-26.

22 ⁶³ See *Rollins v. Massanari*, 261 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001).

1 considering the severity of the reported symptoms.⁶⁴ Here, the ALJ found the
2 medical evidence and record as a whole did not support a more restrictive RFC.⁶⁵
3 As to Plaintiff's physical impairments, the ALJ highlighted that, while the record
4 indicates chronic hip and residual right foot pain with some decreased range of
5 motion, diminished strength and altered/antalgic gait at times, Plaintiff's
6 neuromuscular examinations have otherwise demonstrated no focal neurologic
7 deficits (e.g., typically normal/full motor strength, intact sensation, normal

8

9

10 ⁶⁴ *Id.* "Objective medical evidence" means signs, laboratory findings, or both.

11 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1502(f), 416.902(k). In turn, "signs" is defined as:

12 one or more anatomical, physiological, or psychological
13 abnormalities that can be observed, apart from [the claimant's]
14 statements (symptoms). Signs must be shown by medically
15 demonstrable phenomena that indicate specific psychological
16 abnormalities, e.g., abnormalities of behavior, mood, thought,
memory, orientation, development, or perception, and must also
be shown by observable facts that can be medically described
and evaluated.

17 *Id.* §§ 404.1502(g), 416.902(l). Evidence obtained from the "application of a
18 medically acceptable clinical diagnostic technique, such as evidence of
19 reduced joint motion, muscle spasm, sensory deficits, or motor disruption" is
20 considered objective medical evidence. 3 Soc. Sec. Law & Prac. § 36:26,
21 Consideration of objective medical evidence (2019).

22 ⁶⁵ AR 23.

1 reflexes, normal coordination and ability to ambulate without assistive device).⁶⁶

2 As to Plaintiff's mental health, the ALJ noted that while the record documents
3 diagnoses of PTSD, anxiety disorder, and a history of alcohol abuse (remission
4 since December 2015), the record does not support Plaintiff's allegations of
5 debilitating mental health issues.⁶⁷ The ALJ also found that Plaintiff's psychiatric
6 screenings with treating providers and psychological examiners indicated some
7 reported ongoing PTSD-related, anxiety/panic, and anger symptomatology at
8 times, but otherwise within normal limits (e.g., alert, fully oriented, no acute
9 distress; cooperative, normal speech; consistently euthymic mood/full affect; intact
10 memory, normal thought content and perception; good insight and judgment).⁶⁸

11 This was a relevant factor for the ALJ to consider.

12 Second, the ALJ found that the conservative treatment recommended by
13 Plaintiff's treating providers undermined the severity of his symptom complaints.⁶⁹
14 Evidence of "conservative treatment" is sufficient to discount a claimant's
15
16
17

18
19
20
21
22
23
66 AR 24 (citing AR 414, 612-13, 826-27, & 633).

67 AR 25.

68 AR 25 (citing AR 374-75, 391, 399-400, 404, 414, 423-24, 426, 463, 500, 533,
559, 572, 580, 586, 672, 675, 681, 814-15, & 832).

69 AR 24-26.

1 testimony regarding the severity of an impairment.⁷⁰ Here, the ALJ noted that
2 Plaintiff's treatment primarily consisted of pain and psychiatric medications,
3 physical therapy/stretching, acupuncture, and regular mental health therapy.⁷¹
4 Furthermore, the ALJ noted that often times, Plaintiff reported progress with his
5 course of treatment. "Impairments that can be controlled effectively with
6 medication are not disabling."⁷² The ALJ described medical evidence where
7 Plaintiff's reported mental impairments improved with medication, noting
8 Plaintiff's depression and anxiety symptoms and nightmares were well controlled
9

11 ⁷⁰ *Parra v. Astrue*, 481 F.3d 742 (9th Cir. 2007) (citing *Johnson v. Shalala*, 60
12 F.3d 1428, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995) (treating ailments with an over-the-counter
13 pain medication is evidence of conservative treatment sufficient to discount a
14 claimant's testimony regarding the severity of an impairment)); *see also*
15 *Tommasetti v. Astrue*, 533 F.3d 1035, 1039 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that the
16 ALJ permissible inferred that the claimant's "pain was not as all-disabling as
17 he reported in light of the fact that he did not seek an aggressive treatment
18 program" and "responded favorable to conservative treatment including
19 physical therapy and the use of anti-inflammatory medication, and
20 transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation unit, and lumbosacral corset").

21 ⁷¹ AR 24.

22 ⁷² *Warre v. Comm'r of the Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 439 F.3d 1001, 1006 (9th Cir. 2005).

1 and stable.⁷³ As to Plaintiff's physical impairments, the ALJ noted Plaintiff was
2 attending physical therapy and yoga three times a week and felt good.⁷⁴

3 Plaintiff contends the "ALJ improperly overlooked, mischaracterized, and
4 ignored treatment records," which he claims demonstrates the severity of his
5 symptoms waxed and waned.⁷⁵ An ALJ must consider all of the relevant evidence
6 in the record and may not point only those portions of the record that bolster his
7 findings.⁷⁶ The ALJ's decision does not reflect a selective reliance upon the record,
8 while ignoring other records. The ALJ acknowledged the record showed reports of
9

10 ⁷³ AR 25 (citing AR 392 ("At the last visit the Pt was put on Cymbalta and
11 today he tells me, 'the darkness isn't so dark on the Cymbalta. I like it'
12 depression and anxiety are generally well controlled and moods stable."))
13 (original capitalized all letters)); AR 26 (citing AR 391 ("[Plaintiff] is doing
14 well on his meds and wants no changes." (original capitalized all letters)); AR
15 764 ("Everything is flowing well.' States his depression and anxiety are well
16 controlled and his moods are stable. Nightmares are well controlled. He likes
17 his med plan and wants no changes." (original capitalized all letters))).

18 ⁷⁴ AR 25 & 762.

19 ⁷⁵ ECF No. 13 at 17.

20 ⁷⁶ See, e.g., *Holohan v. Massanari*, 246 F.3d 1195, 1207-08 (9th Cir. 2001)
21 (holding that an ALJ cannot selectively rely on some entries in plaintiff's
22 records while ignoring others).

1 PTSD-related anxiety/panic and anger/rage symptomology at times, but
2 determined they were relatively within normal limits and incorporated social
3 functions in the RFC.⁷⁷ The ALJ reasonably interpreted the evidence as a whole
4 and permissibly discounted Plaintiff's subject complaints based on generally
5 conservative treatment and effective control with medication.

6 Lastly, the ALJ also discounted Plaintiff's symptom reports because they
7 were inconsistent with his high functioning activities of daily living.⁷⁸ If a claimant
8 can spend a substantial part of the day engaged in pursuits involving the
9 performance of exertional or non-exertional functions, the ALJ may find these
10 activities inconsistent with the reported disabling symptoms.⁷⁹ The ALJ
11 highlighted that Plaintiff lives with his wife and two children, manages his
12 personal care and medication, fixes his own meals, performs household chores,
13 cares for pets, grocery shops, and completes yard work.⁸⁰ Plaintiff argues that it's
14 not "that his breadth of activities are limited by his mental health symptoms" but
15 "maintains that he is unable to work on a regular, continuous basis due to . . .
16 interruptions from psychological symptoms" and "severe pain symptoms interfering
17

18
19 ⁷⁷ AR 25.

20 ⁷⁸ AR 24.

21 ⁷⁹ *Molina*, 674 F.3d at 1113.

22 ⁸⁰ AR 26.

1 with focus and concentration.”⁸¹ However, Plaintiff was able to go on vacation to
2 Mexico with 17 family members and scuba dive twice after going through a
3 certification process in a training pool, attend a concert, attend bible study weekly,
4 swim four time a week for weight loss, and planned to get a certificate to be a
5 caretake for his brother.⁸² On this record, the ALJ reasonably concluded that
6 Plaintiff’s activities indicated Plaintiff could perform a limited range of sedentary
7 exertional work with limited social interaction. This finding is supported by
8 substantial evidence and was a clear and convincing reason to discount Plaintiff’s
9 symptom complaints.

10 **D. Lay Witness: Plaintiff fails to establish consequential error.**

11 Plaintiff also challenges the ALJ’s rejection of the lay witness testimony of
12 his wife. For claims filed on or after March 27, 2017, new regulations provide that
13 the ALJs are “not required to articulate how [they] considered evidence from
14 nonmedical sources.”⁸³ Consequently, there is an argument the ALJ is no longer
15 required to provide reasons that are germane to reject lay witness testimony.⁸⁴

16
17 ⁸¹ ECF No. 13 at 19.

18 ⁸² AR 26-27.

19 ⁸³ 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520c(d), 416.920c(d).

20 ⁸⁴ See *Wendy J.C. v. Saul*, No. 3:19-cv-01434-AC, 2020 WL 6161402, at n.9 (D.
21 Or. October 21, 2020) (“The new regulations provide the ALJ is ‘not required
22 to articulate how [they] considered evidence from nonmedical sources’ 20
23

1 However, some courts have found that § 404.1520c(d) “does not eliminate the need
 2 for the ALJ to articulate his consideration of lay-witness statements and his
 3 reasons for discounting those statements.”⁸⁵

4 Neither party addressed this change in law, and it appears the ALJ assumes
 5 that he does not have to provide articulation about lay witness testimony.⁸⁶
 6 Without deciding whether the ALJ is to articulate his consideration of lay witness
 7 statements and provide a reason for discounting those statements, any error by the
 8 ALJ in failing to consider Plaintiff’s wife’s testimony is harmless.

9 Here, Plaintiffs wife completed a third-party function report in August 2018
 10 and October 2018.⁸⁷ “[I]n accordance with 20 C.F.R. 404.1520b(c) and 416.920b(c),
 11 the [ALJ did] not provide articulation about [the August 2018 report], which [he

12
 13 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520c(d) (2019), 416.920c(d). As such, the ALJ is no longer
 14 required to provide reasons germane to lay witnesses to reject their
 15 testimony.”); *Kyra H. Comm’r of the Soc. Sec. Admin.*, No. 6:18-cv-01979-AC,
 16 2020 WL 2216912, at n.8 (D. Or. May 7, 2020) (same).

17 ⁸⁵ *Joseph M.R. v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 3:18-cv-01779-BR, 2019 WL 4279027, at
 18 *12 (D. Or. Sept. 10, 2019).

19 ⁸⁶ AR 29 (“[I]n accordance with 20 CFR 404.1520b(c) and 416.920b(c), the
 20 undersigned does not provide articulation about this evidence, which is
 21 inherently neither valuable nor persuasive.”).

22 ⁸⁷ AR 205-12 & 245-52.
 23

1 found was] inherently neither valuable nor persuasive.”⁸⁸ Plaintiff argues the ALJ
2 erred in “ignore[ing] or summarily reject[ing]” the lay witness’ August 2018 report
3 and “completely overlook[ing]” the October 2018 report.⁸⁹ Where the ALJ gives
4 clear and convincing reasons to reject a claimant’s testimony, and where a lay
5 witness’ testimony is similar to the claimant’s subjective complaints, the reasons
6 given to reject the claimant’s testimony are also germane reasons to reject the lay
7 witness testimony.⁹⁰

8 On August 9, 2018, Plaintiff’s wife completed a third-party function report.⁹¹
9 Plaintiff’s wife reported Plaintiff’s daily activities include grooming, making meals,
10 taking care of his children, and night terrors (1-2 nights per week). Plaintiff’s wife
11 also reported Plaintiff’s foot/hip pain prevents him from standing, walking, or
12 completing physical activities for more than 10-15 minutes at a time. Plaintiff’s
13 wife also reported Plaintiff was able to complete yard work, laundry, and cleaning
14 with direct instruction and reminders, and hunt every Saturday during the season.
15 Plaintiff’s wife also reported Plaintiff was able to attend bible study and dinner
16

17 ⁸⁸ AR 29.

18 ⁸⁹ ECF No. 13 at 16.

19 ⁹⁰ See *Valentine v. Comm’r Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 574 F.3d 685, 694 (9th Cir. 2009)
20 (ALJ may reject lay testimony that essentially reproduces the claimant’s
21 discredited testimony).

22 ⁹¹ AR 205-12.

1 with extended family and visit the gym and library with his children. Plaintiff's
2 wife also reported that Plaintiff was unable to handle groups greater than five
3 people. On October 1, 2018, Plaintiff's wife completed a second third-party function
4 report with similar reported daily activities and limitations.⁹²

5 Plaintiff's wife's testimony was similar to Plaintiff's own subjective
6 complaints.⁹³ Because, as discussed above, the ALJ gave clear and convincing
7 reasons supported by substantial evidence in the record in discounting Plaintiff's
8 own subjective complaints and Plaintiff's wife's testimony repeated Plaintiff's
9 complaints, any error by the ALJ in failing to consider Plaintiff's wife's testimony
10 is harmless.⁹⁴

11 Plaintiff fails to establish consequential error by the ALJ in this regard.

12 **E. Step Five: Plaintiff fails to establish error.**

13 Plaintiff argues that the ALJ's hypothetical failed to consider the limitations
14 set forth by his providers. However, this argument merely restates Plaintiff's
15 earlier allegations of error, which are not supported by the record. Accordingly, the
16

17 ⁹² AR 245-52.

18 ⁹³ AR 41-49 & 213-21; *compare with* AR 205-12 & 245-52.

19 ⁹⁴ *Valentine*, 574 F.3d at 694 (noting that the ALJ's rejection of the claimant's
20 spouse's lay testimony because she was an interested party who never saw the
21 claimant at work was harmless since the lay testimony repeated the claimant's
22 allegations, and the ALJ found that the claimant's allegations were not credible).
23

ALJ's hypothetical properly accounted for the limitations supported by the record.⁹⁵

V. Conclusion

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, **ECF No. 13**, is **DENIED**.
2. The Commissioner's Motion for Summary Judgment, **ECF No. 15**, is **GRANTED**.
3. The Clerk's Office shall enter **JUDGMENT** in favor of Defendant.
4. The case shall be **CLOSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The Clerk's Office is directed to file this Order and provide copies to all counsel.

DATED this 18th day of November 2020.

s/Edward F. Shea
EDWARD F. SHEA
Senior United States District Judge

⁹⁵ See *Magallanes*, 881 F.2d at 756–57 (holding it is proper for the ALJ to limit a hypothetical to those restrictions supported by substantial evidence in the record).